

1

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2

3

4

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

5

6

7

8

*Ex parte* SHAWN WIEDERIN

9

10

11

Appeal 2007-2172

12

Application 09/950,025

13

Technology Center 3600

14

15

16

Decided: October 19, 2007

17

18

19 Before WILLIAM F. PATE, III, LINDA E. HORNER, and ANTON W.  
20 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

21 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

22

DECISION ON APPEAL

23

24

25

26

STATEMENT OF CASE

27 Shawn Wiederin (Appellant) seeks review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 of a Final  
28 rejection of claims 2-6, 8, 9, 12-16, 18, 19, 22-26, 28, 29, 32-36, 38, 39, and 41-45,  
29 the only claims pending in the application on appeal.

30 We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

31

32 We AFFIRM.

33

1 The Appellant invented a way to allow a user of a wireless or a wired device,  
 2 or a combination of devices, to perform a transfer of currency or monetary funds  
 3 from one on-line financial account to one or more on-line financial account(s). In  
 4 general, in an exemplary embodiment of this invention, after a user's account  
 5 profile is created, all the necessary steps to verify the profile, the account's fund  
 6 availability, security related functions and debiting and crediting of the respective  
 7 accounts can be initiated from the user device (Specification 2:¶ 0004).

8 An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary  
 9 claim 42, which is reproduced below [bracketed matter and some paragraphing  
 10 added].

11 42. A monetary transaction system comprising:  
 12 a payment processing system configured to:  
 13 [1] receive payee, user, and amount information from a wireless  
 14 device associated with the user,  
 15 [2] identify a first account associated with the user based on the  
 16 user information,  
 17 [3] identify a second account associated with the payee based  
 18 on the payee information,  
 19 [4] transfer funds based on the amount information between the  
 20 first account and the second account, and  
 21 [5] send a notification of the transfer of the funds to the  
 22 wireless device,  
 23 the notification including an itemization of goods or  
 24 services associated with the transfer.

25

26

27 This appeal arises from the Examiner's Final Rejection, mailed August 5,  
 28 2005. The Appellant filed an Appeal Brief in support of the appeal on January 5,  
 29 2006. An Examiner's Answer to the Appeal Brief was mailed on March 13, 2006.

## PRIOR ART

2 The Examiner relies upon the following prior art:

Shkedy US 6,260,024 B1 Jul. 10, 2001

## REJECTIONS

4 Claims 12-16, 18, 19, 22-26, 28, 29, 43, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.  
5§ 102(e) as anticipated by Shkedy.

6 Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 32-36, 38, 39, 41, 42, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.  
7§ 103(a) as unpatentable over Shkedy.

## ISSUES

9 The issues pertinent to this appeal are

- 10 • Whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the  
11 Examiner erred in rejecting claims 12-16, 18, 19, 22-26, 28, 29, 43, and 44  
12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Shkedy.
- 13 • Whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the  
14 Examiner erred in rejecting claims 2-6, 8, 9, 32-36, 38, 39, 41, 42, and 45  
15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shkedy.

16 The pertinent issue turns on whether Shkedy discloses receiving payee  
17information from a wireless device associated with a user.

## FACTS PERTINENT TO THE ISSUES

19 The following enumerated Findings of Fact (FF) are believed to be supported  
20by a preponderance of the evidence.

21 *Claim Construction*

22 1. The disclosure contains no lexicographic definition of “payee.”

- 1        2. The ordinary and customary meaning of “payee” is one to whom money  
2        is paid.<sup>1</sup>

3        *Shkedy*

- 4        3. Shkedy is directed towards an intermediary between buyers and at least  
5        one seller. A buyer determines an item or service to be purchased, and  
6        enters a conditional purchase order. The buyer receives a maximum offer  
7        price from the intermediary which the buyer accepts or rejects. If the  
8        buyer accepts the maximum offer price, the buyers' conditional purchase  
9        order is combined into a pooled purchase order with other buyers. The  
10       pooled purchase order is then made available to sellers to bid on. Any  
11       sellers interested in the pooled purchase order will submit a bid  
12       responsive to the conditional pooled purchase order, including the  
13       maximum offer price. A seller will be selected whose bid is the best, e.g.  
14       lowest price. Payment can be provided by the intermediary to the seller  
15       having the lowest bid (Shkedy 3:39-57).
- 16       4. Shkedy describes the steps associated with the creation, transmission and  
17       inclusion of a forward purchase order (FPO) into the pooled purchase  
18       order (PPO) database. A buyer selects the category of goods or service to  
19       be purchased. The buyer selects the particular item or service in the  
20       category. The buyer adds a quantity along with any other required buyer  
21       specified conditions. A buyer will specify along with item, quantity, and  
22       buyer identification data, the pool date (i.e. seller bidding date) he  
23       wishes to participate in and an outside delivery date. The pool date  
24       represents the specific date at which the intermediary will make the PPO

---

8<sup>1</sup> *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (4<sup>th</sup> ed. 2000).

available to the sellers for bidding. A buyer must select only a single pool date into which his FPO will be included (Shkedy 5:7-24).

5. Shkedy describes the how the FPO is converted into a PPO for vendor review once a buyer is authenticated and credit worthy. A central controller assigns a unique tracking number to the FPO and adds it to the pooled purchase order database. The central controller publishes or displays the PPO in a manner accessible by potential sellers. A seller could see a listing of PPO categories. The seller could then choose a particular category and have the ability to browse PPOs which correspond to that category (Shkedy 6:1-15).

6. Shkedy describes how a PPO is awarded by the central controller (intermediary) sending a purchase confirmation to the seller. Once the transaction has been completed, i.e., the goods have been delivered, the intermediary pays the seller preferably in a single payment for the total cost of the PPO (Shkedy 6:29-34).

7. Shkedy describes how communications between the various parties may be transmitted via numerous means including a world-wide-web interface, personal digital assistant (PDA), electronic mail, voice mail, facsimile, or postal mail (Shkedy 6:40-44).

8. Communications by a PDA is performed wirelessly.

## PRINCIPLES OF LAW

### *Claim Construction*

During examination of a patent application, pending claims are given their broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification. *In*

1 *re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05 (CCPA 1969); *In re Am. Acad. of Sci.*  
 2 *Tech Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

3 Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not  
 4 read into the claim. *E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp.*, 343 F.3d 1364, 1369 (Fed.  
 5 Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted “in view of the specification” without  
 6 importing limitations from the specification into the claims unnecessarily)

7 Although a patent applicant is entitled to be his or her own lexicographer of  
 8 patent claim terms, in *ex parte* prosecution it must be within limits. *In re Corr*,  
 9 347 F.2d 578, 580 (CCPA 1965). The applicant must do so by placing such  
 10 definitions in the Specification with sufficient clarity to provide a person of  
 11 ordinary skill in the art with clear and precise notice of the meaning that is to be  
 12 construed. *See also In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1480 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (although  
 13 an inventor is free to define the specific terms used to describe the invention, this  
 14 must be done with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision; where an  
 15 inventor chooses to give terms uncommon meanings, the inventor must set out any  
 16 uncommon definition in some manner within the patent disclosure so as to give  
 17 one of ordinary skill in the art notice of the change).

#### 18 *Anticipation*

19 "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim  
 20 is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."  
 21 *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir.  
 22 1987). "When a claim covers several structures or compositions, either generically  
 23 or as alternatives, the claim is deemed anticipated if any of the structures or  
 24 compositions within the scope of the claim is known in the prior art." *Brown v.*  
 25 *3M*, 265 F.3d 1349, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2001). "The identical invention must be  
 26 shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki*

1 *Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged  
2 as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of  
3 terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

#### 4 *Obviousness*

5 A claimed invention is unpatentable if the differences between it and the  
6 prior art are “such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at  
7 the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art.”

8 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (2000); *KSR Int’l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727 (2007);  
9 *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 13-14 (1966).

10 In *Graham*, the Court held that that the obviousness analysis is bottomed on  
11 several basic factual inquiries: “[ (1) ] the scope and content of the prior art are to be  
12 determined; [ (2) ] differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be  
13 ascertained; and [ (3) ] the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved.” 383  
14 U.S. at 17. *See also KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1734. “The combination of familiar  
15 elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more  
16 than yield predictable results.” *KSR*, at 1739.

17 “When a work is available in one field of endeavor, design incentives and  
18 other market forces can prompt variations of it, either in the same field or in a  
19 different one. If a person of ordinary skill in the art can implement a predictable  
20 variation, § 103 likely bars its patentability.” *Id.* at 1740.

21 “For the same reason, if a technique has been used to improve one device,  
22 and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve  
23 similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual  
24 application is beyond his or her skill.” *Id.*

1 “Under the correct analysis, any need or problem known in the field of  
2 endeavor at the time of invention and addressed by the patent can provide a reason  
3 for combining the elements in the manner claimed.” *Id.* at 1742.

4 ANALYSIS

5 *Claims 12-16, 18, 19, 22-26, 28, 29, 43, and 44 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)*  
6 *as anticipated by Shkedy.*

7 The Appellant argues these claims as a group.

8 Accordingly, we select claim 43 as representative of the group, and the  
9 remaining claims will stand or fall with claim 43. 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii)  
10 (2006).

11 The Examiner found that Shkedy anticipated claim 43 as follows (Answer 3-4)  
12 [bracketed matter and some paragraphing added].

13 43. A method for performing a monetary transaction, [(abstract and  
14 Figs. 1-2)]  
15 comprising:  
16 [1] receiving payee, user, and amount information from a wireless  
17 device associated with a user; [(column 5 lines 2-35 and column 6  
18 lines 40-47, 53-63 and column 8 lines 57-65 and column 11 lines 21-  
19 24 and Figs. 1-2; specifically, "payee" corresponds to the seller, and  
20 "user" corresponds to the buyer in Shkedy's teaching)]  
21 [2] identifying a first account associated with the user based on the  
22 user information; [(column 10 lines 1-10 and column 11 lines 8-12  
23 and Fig. 2)]  
24 [3] prompting a payee device associated with the payee,  
25 for information relating to a second account associated with the  
26 payee  
27 based on the payee information; and [(column 6 lines 4-32 and  
28 column 11 line 64 - column 12 line 34 and Fig. 2)]  
29 [4] transferring funds based on the amount information



1           between the first account and the second account. [(column 18  
2           line 37 - column 19 line 54)]

3       The Appellant contends that Shkedy does not disclose receiving payee  
4 information from a wireless device associated with a user (Br. 5:Second ¶). The  
5 Appellant recites several portions of Shkedy and then concludes as follows.

6       These sections of SHKEDY disclose the type of information  
7       submitted by buyers in creating forward purchase orders (FPO's) for  
8       bidding by *potential* sellers. These sections of SHKEDY also disclose  
9       the manner in which the information is received. Contrary to the  
10      Examiner's interpretation, these sections of SHKEDY clearly do not  
11      disclose receiving payee (or seller) information *from a wireless device*  
12      *associated with the user*. Rather, SHKEDY specifically indicates that  
13      the buyer is submitting an FPO for inclusion in a *bidding pool* which  
14      may then be bid upon by multiple potential sellers. The receipt of  
15      specific payee information from the buyer would eliminate the very  
16      benefits that the system of SHKEDY offers, i.e., the ability for buyers  
17      to create and submit purchase orders to an intermediary for  
18      presentation to multiple potential sellers. Therefore, SHKEDY can not  
19      be fairly construed to disclose or suggest receiving payee information  
20      from a wireless device, as required by claim 43.

21      Furthermore, the above-recited sections of SHKEDY further indicate  
22      that central controller 200 "manages the payment system between the  
23      buyer and the seller automatically" (see col. 6, lines 53-54). More  
24      specifically, the central controller 200 of SHKEDY may use an  
25      intermediary escrow account for transitioning funds between buyers  
26      and sellers. By facilitating payment through central controller 200,  
27      payee information is never required from the buyer.

28 (Br. 7-8) (emphasis in original.)

29      The Examiner responded that Shkedy teaches the user (or the buyer) submits a  
30 forward purchase order (FPO) that includes potential payee information (Answer  
31 7:Bottom ¶).

1 Thus the sole issue before us is whether Shkedy describes the element [1]  
2 limitation of receiving payee information from a wireless device associated with a  
3 user.

4 We must first construe the claim limitation. The Specification does not define  
5 the phrase “payee information,” but the usual and customary meaning of payee is  
6 one to whom money is paid (FF &). The word “payee” in the phrase “payee  
7 information” is a noun modifier characterizing the noun “information.” Payee  
8 information is then information that is in some manner characterized by one to  
9 whom money is paid.

10 We find that there is nothing in the claim that specifies the precise nature of the  
11 payee information, and in particular it does not have to identify the payee. Since  
12 payee information is information related to a payee, such information might point  
13 to a payee, or it might provide facts pertinent to a seller as payee, such as the  
14 quantity and description of what is ordered, or when the order is placed and  
15 delivery is requested. We also find that the claim does not require that the payee  
16 be known at the time the information is received so long as it characterizes the one  
17 who is ultimately paid.

18 We find that Shkedy is directed towards an intermediary between buyers and at  
19 least one seller (FF ). Shkedy describes information is received from buyers to  
20 describe a forward purchase order, including items, quantity, buyer identification  
21 and pool date (FF ). Shkedy describes that this information may be communicated  
22 by a wireless device (FF &). This forward purchase order is converted into a  
23 pooled purchase order with a unique tracking number that vendors bid on (FF ).  
24 After a vendor is awarded the pooled purchase order and fulfills its conditions, the  
25 vendor is paid (FF ).

1 We find that the information, particularly the quantity and description of what  
2 is ordered and the pool date (FF ), received from the buyer, which may arrive  
3 wirelessly, are contents of the FPO. The FPO becomes the PPO, which is awarded  
4 to a vendor, who is paid. Thus, this information describes and identifies the PPO  
5 and by inference, points to the vendor who is awarded that PPO. Certainly the  
6 pool identifier identifies the PPO and therefore by the time it is paid, identifies the  
7 payee. Thus, the information received to identify the FPO is information that is in  
8 some manner characterized by one to whom money is paid, certainly at the time of  
9 payment.

10 The Appellant has not sustained its burden of showing that the Examiner erred  
11 in rejecting claims 12-16, 18, 19, 22-26, 28, 29, 43, and 44 under  
12 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Shkedy.

1 *Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 32-36, 38, 39, 41, 42, and 45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)*  
2 *as unpatentable over Shkedy.*

3 The Appellant argues these claims as a group and we select claim 42 as  
4 representative. The remaining claims will stand or fall with claim 42.

5 The Appellant contends that Shkedy does not disclose receiving payee  
6 information from a wireless device associated with a user (Br. 10:Second full ¶).  
7 This is the same argument made in support of claim 43, *supra*. We found that  
8 Shkedy does disclose receiving payee information from a wireless device  
9 associated with a user, *supra*.

10 The Appellant has not sustained its burden of showing that the Examiner erred  
11 in rejecting claims 2-6, 8, 9, 32-36, 38, 39, 41, 42, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)  
12 as unpatentable over Shkedy.

13 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

14 The Appellant has not sustained its burden of showing that the Examiner erred  
15 in rejecting claims 12-16, 18, 19, 22-26, 28, 29, 43, and 44 under  
16 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by the prior art and claims 2-6, 8, 9, 32-36, 38,  
17 39, 41, 42, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the prior art.

18 On this record, the Appellant is not entitled to a patent containing claims 2-6,  
19 8, 9, 12-16, 18, 19, 22-26, 28, 29, 32-36, 38, 39, and 41-45.

20 DECISION

21 To summarize, our decision is as follows:

- 22 • The rejection of claims 12-16, 18, 19, 22-26, 28, 29, 43, and 44 under  
23 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Shkedy is affirmed.

29Appeal 2007-2172  
30Application 09/950,025  
31

1 • The rejection of claims 2-6, 8, 9, 32-36, 38, 39, 41, 42, and 45 under  
2 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shkedy is affirmed.

3 No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal  
4 may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

5 AFFIRMED

6

7

8

9

10JRG

11

12VERIZON  
13PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP  
141515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD  
15SUITE 500  
16ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909